MORMONISM.

Dr. Newman's Great Sermon in Salt Lake City.

DOES THE BIBLE SANCTION POLYGAMY?

Religious, Moral, Political and Social Aspects of the Question.

Plurality of Wives as Practised by the Prophets.

The Great Polygamic Sinners and the Roll of Monor.

SALT LAKE CITY, August 8, 1870. The visit of the Rev. Dr. Newman to Salt Lake City has created much excitement here among both 'saints" and "sinners." For several weeks his arrival was looked forward to with unusual interest. presenting, as ne does, the moral and religious entiments of the nation upon the barbarous institution of polygamy, his presence here has been imatiently awaited by those who were anxious to hear im assail the most peculiar and repugnant system of the saints. The occasion of his coming here is this:—On the 3d of March last, when the Culiom bill to abolish polygamy in Utah was being discussed in Congress, Mr. Hooper, the Mormon Delegate, delivered an elaborate argument in the Rouse of Representatives against the legislation which the Cullom bill proposed. By far the greater portion of his speech was devoted to a defence of polygamy on Bible grounds. Dr. Newman being chaplain of the Senate, men high in authority often asked him, "Does the Bible sanction olygamy?" In view of the religious character of the question, and of the proposed legislation by Congress concerning affairs in Utah, Dr. Newman determined to answer the question from the pulpit. Accordingly on Sunday, April 24, he preached a sermon in his church in Washington condemning the system on the authority of the Scriptures, which was published in full in the NEW YORK HERALD on the following morning. Elder Orson Pratt, one of the Twelve ostles of the Mormon Church, prepared a reply, which was adopted by the Church in conference, nd printed in the HERALD on the 80th of May. De Newman wrote a rejoinder to Pratt's reply, and the goinder appeared in the HERALD on the 3d of July. eanwhile the Salt Lake Daily Telegraph, com menting on the Doctor's sermon, said:-"The sermon should have been delivered in the New Tabernacie in this city, with 10,000 Mormons to listen to it, and then Elder Pratt or some other prominent ould have had a hearing on the othe side, and the people been allowed to decide." This, together with the remarks which followed, being regarded as a challenge him to come to Utah and discuss the question of polygamy from a Scriptural standint, he did not feel at liberty to decline it. He anounced his intention of coming here in August to preach a series of sermons or debate the question Brigham Young. After his departure from Washington on his journey hither the Descret Ecening News, which is the official organ of the Mormon Church, in a leading article on the Doctor's ap proaching visit, expressed its ignorance of any spe fic challenge for a discussion, and suggested that if Dr. Newman should come here he might have the use of the Tabernacie to preach in if he would eciprocate the favor by allowing a Mormon elder to preach from his puipit in his metropolitan church in Washington. Two days thereafter the Salt Lake Herald, which arose out of the ruins of the Telegraph, undertook to solve the lisputed question of the challenge by referring to article which had been published in the Tele graph. The Herald did not consider it an authoriative challenge. It would seem that when it was known that Dr. Newman was really coming to assail polygamy in its own dominions, the Mormon leaders, deeming "discretion the better part of valor," concluded to decline the contest. Hence, on his arrival here last Friday, the "presiding priestood" and certain elders and apostles knew nothing of any proposed discussion. But many of the Mormons and all of the Gentiles took it for granted that there would be a public debate in the Tabernacle after the arrival of Dr. Newman. On the morning after his arrival he wrote Brigham Young a note prepared to discuss the question. Brigham Young replied that Dr. Newman, in coming here in answer him, was laboring under a misapprehension. Dr. Newman expressed his surprise at Brigham Young's interpretation, and went on to show how the article in question, from which he quoted in his letter, was ized challenge from the Church. This correspond ence took place on Saturday. When Dr. Newman and declined discussion he accepted an invitation to preach on Sunday afternoon in the hall in which the Methodists hold their religious services. After these arrangements were completed, on Saturday afternoon Young invited Newman to preach on Sunday in the Tabernacle, but Newman, having made the other engagement to preach on Sunday afternoon, was compelled to decline the invitation. This correspondence was telegraphed in full on Sunday to the HERALD. It has since been continued, and other letters, containing some spicy personalities, and which are appended, passed be tween the champion of monogamy and the polygamic prophet. Meanwhile, however, Dr. Newman delivered his great discourse against polygamy, in the Methodist meeting-house, as stated. The hall was crowded to its utmost capacity, many people being unable to find standing room in it; and the audience listened with rapt attention for three hours

and a half to his eloquent and able argument. The reverend gentleman took for his text part of the fourth verse of the nineteenth chapter of the

Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female.

I have, he said, a threefold object in speaking to you to-day. The first is to do good. Yet my hopes are not extravagant, for I remember that St. Paul, whose intellect was imperial, whose eloquence was matchless, after he had delivered his great sermon on Mar's Hill, could count only Dionystus Damaris and one or two others as fruit of his sermon in that idolatrous city. I know too much of early education, too much of religious prejudice, to of the latter are to be obliterated in a day. The second object is to announce a great gospel truth in this city, where it is denied to argue a question which, in its essential nature, is disputed, and in that denial the Hely Bible is claimed as authority. In other words, I stand here in the stronghold of polygamy, where the great advocates of polygamy are; where they can have the opportunity to refute what I affirm if they can, and where, on my part. I display what I trust is commendable Christian courage in preaching my gospel to those who do not believe it. The third object is, that I desire to present to the Church and the nation a clear exposition of the doctrine of monogamy, as taught in the Bible, and as it stands in sublime contradiction to the doctrine of polygamy, which is in this city claimed to be a Bible The text contains the truth 1 propose to advocate, the question I design to discuss; and if for your convenience I sum up the question and the doctrine as taught in the text in a logical proposi-

tion or question, it is this—
DOES THE BIBLE SANCTION POLYGAMY?
Here in this city this question is affirmed, but here on this platform I deny it; and in support of my doctrine I propose to consider nine propositions.

MARRIAGE DESIGNED TO BE MONOGAMOUS. The first proposition is that marriage, established by the Almighty in the time of man's innocency, is monogamous—the union in wed-

this question is found in another question—"What was the marriage of Adam and Eve?" Their marriage being the first recorded, and referred to by prophets, and Christ, and his Apostics, it is but fair to conclude that that was the pattern marriage for all subsequent generations. In other words, in that marriage was the great law of marriage to remain in force while time shall last, and be binding upon all generations of men and all nations upon the face of the globe. In considering marriage we ought to giance at its design, its nature, its obligations, Its essential elements, its rights and its muniments. The design of marriage is threefold-companion ship, procreation, prevention. Ere Eve had gazed upon the rosy skies of Paradise or breathed its balmy air the Almignty Oreator had said, "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a neip-meet for him." Thus, companionship takes precedence; the soul is first, the body comes second. God looks to the social relations of His creatures, to that should characterize marriage, which grows out of marriage, which is an essential of marriage, which is the crowning giory of marriage; and where there is no companionship there is no true mar-

The second design is procreation. It pleased the Almighty Creator to adopt the plan of peopling the earth by the off-pring of one pair—one man and one woman. Hence the command, "Be and multiply and replenish the earth." And this same purpose was again made manifest after the flood, by God saving in thegark eight persons-four men and four women-and unto whom He gave the same command that He had given to Adam and Eve, "Be fruttful and multiply and renecessity growing out of the constitution of nature.

companionship first and offspring second. It was
the design of marriage to prevent the indiscriminate
or promiscuous intercourse of the sexes; to lift man
above the brute, that men and women should not,
like brutes, intermit, with each other promiscuously,
but that each man should have her own husband.
Such being the design, what is the nature of marriage? Marriago is an institution rather than a
law. It is a state rather than an act—something
that is formed, framed; something that has been
reared, something that has been
reared, something that has been
reared something that has b

ing," and he who will not protect the woman whom he has swern at the brital state to protect is unworthy of his manhood, any of the divine mage in which he was created. These rights may be declined from choice of cellacy, but when one may be declined from choice of cellacy, but when one when cast, ensues or adultery is committed.

What shall have the defences of this exhited condition? First, its innocency. The union of a man or woman in wedlock is essentially holy, and when assumed according to law is as pure as Edon. Second, its honorabieness. "Marriage is honorabie in all, and the bed undefled, but whorenomers and adulterers God will judge." Then come the 'anctions of law; first the Divine and then the human. Around this hallowed institution that has some down to us from the sewer groves of Edon God has frown the awful sanctions of Mount Sinsi; and Jesus, the Divine Reacuer, who spake as never may around it the scheme sanctions of home series and adulting the series of the globe marriage is not only recognized, but is protected by law. Next comes the affinity of the sexes. God has ordained in the very constitution of humanity that man and woman shall naturally and mutually love and desire each older. The desire is natural, mutual, reciprocal; and these very animites are expressive of a law unwritten, but as true as the law distribution. Then, subordinate to, but is provident in the complete of the first marriage and females in all countries. It is a great mystery to us how this proportion of males and females in all countries. It is a great mystery to us how this proportion of males and females in all countries. It is a great mystery to us how this proportion of males and females in all countries. Such its clear, muranished statement and expession of the first marriage and disproved. As no far have now been been successfully contradicted and disproved. As no far have now the proportion of males and females in minimals, the rights and the munimals of the first marriage cannot be rights and afterwards clothed

sages in which these celebrated words occur. Gen eas, Il., 24—"And they shall be one flesh." Matthew, xix., 5—"The twain shall be one flesh." Mark, x., &—"And they two shall be one flesh." Ephesians, v., 31—"And they two shall be one flesh." I. Corinthians, vi., 16—"For two, saith He, shall be one flesh." A reference to each of these texts will sustain the assertion that in each instance the expression is expressive of wedlock. No amount of skill or dexterity of "play on words" will be sufficient to destroy the force of the word "twain," or "two," as used by the Holy Ghost. To say that after marriage the two persons are two persons is like saying that twice one make two. It is not said they two shall be "one person," but "one flesh"—exclusively expressive of the common fortunes incident to weddock and the act of copulation in the procreation of children.

But it is objected—now mark you—that if "force

children.

But it is objected—now mark you—that if "one nesh" is exclusively expressive of wedlock then St. Paul affirms that sexual commerce with a harlot is marriage. For argument I accept the conclusion, and affirm that the apostle so states. The passage in question is in I. Cerinthians, vl., 16, 17—"What know be not that he which is joined to a harlot is one body; for two, saith He, shall be one flesh. But he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit." Now what are the facts? The apostle is here showing the true relation of the believer to Christ. And this relation is litustrated under the figure of marriage. The design of this figure is to show that the believer becomes one with Christ, or, as is expressed in the context, "a member of Christ's body; he object of Paul is to demonstrate to the Corinthian Christians that idolaters, fornicaters and adulterers cannot be members of Christ's body; and in proof of this the apostle asserts "The body is not for fornication, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body," "Know ys not," he asked, "that your bodies are the members of Christ's had to enforce this idea if possible still more strongly he changes the form of expression and says "He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit." And now, to dissuade the Corinchian believers from association with fornicators, adulterers and idolators, he reminds them that by such associations they become one with them, and this dissuasion is enforced by the consideration that a man who marries a harlot becomes identical with her, or, as the apostle says, "one flesh." And that the expression "One desh" is predicated of marriage is clear from the fact that the term used to indicate the bellever's spiritual relation to Christ, elsewhere called marriage, is the exact term used to indicate the bellever's spiritual relation to Carist, elsewhere called marriage, is the exact term used to chicate the bellever's spiritual relation to Carist, elsewhere called marriage, is the exact term used to ordinate the bellever's spiritual relation t

predicated of marriage is clear from the fact that the term used to incluste the bellever's spirtual relation to Christ, elsewhere called marriage, is the exact term used to express the relation to a hardo of a man who marries a hardo.

Polygamy a Violation of Marriage, is the exact term used to express the relation to a hardo of a man who marries a hardo.

Polygamy a Violation of Marriage.

Now we are prepared for our second proposition—namely, that polygamy is a violation of the institution of marriage as originally cetablished by the Almighty at the time of man's minocency, and subacquently defined in His word in the following particuliars:—First, I violates the design of marriage by modifying the natural measure of capacity for companionship and procreation between the parties. The natural measure of capacity for companionship and procreation between the parties. The natural measure of capacity is that which subsists between one pair only—one male and one female. This is disturbed and disordered by polygamy. Markind are not mere animals; they are likewise social, rational, immortal beings. Marriage is not the mere gratification of animal propensities. Men are not to treat women as buils and tams and the area for the relation of animal propensities. Men are not to treat women as unless that the substitution of the season of the particular of the relation of the season of the particular of one sex over the other. Some authorities say males, other authorities say females. It maters not, the fact is admitted the social evil." It is itself "the social evil." It is read to the capacity of the social evil. The

rial equality. It is, therefore, in every point of yow, evil and only evil, and that contanually. Thus we unhesitatingly declare that the institution of polygamy is violative of the institution of marriage as established by the Almiguity in the times of man's innocency, and handed down to us by the prophets, by Jesas Christ, and by the noily aposities.

Now we are prepared for our third proposition. What is adultery? As adultery is distinguished in Scripture from whoredom and fornication, it is project to ascertian the exact meaning of these words as used by the sacred writers. The word translated whoredom is from the Hebrew root zanck and the Greek posneta, and means poliution, defilement, lewness, prostitution, and in common parance whoredom is the prostitucion of the person for gain. The word translated fornication is from the same Hebrew root zanck, and in general significant of the property of the same Hebrew root zanck, and in general signifies or minal sexual intercourse without the formalities of marriage. In Scripture it is taken for—first, the sin of impurity committee between unmarried persons. I. Commitians the committee the ween unmarried persons. I. Commitians the committee the same of the same first the same of impurity committee the ween unmarried persons. I. Commitians the committee the same of the same first property of the cause of ornication, causeth her less that the same same and that is not betterded, and lie with her, he shall surely endow her to be his wife." Second—lies taken for the sin of adultery when one or both of the persons are married. Matthew, v, 32. "But is any unity of the cause of fornication, causeth her that is divorced committeth adultery." Third—first singulations of the committen adultery with a word was played to commit adultery; and whosever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery with a word was played to committe the different words of the formal surely discussed in the same property of the formal surely discussed in the same property of the formal sur

lygamy is or is not commanded by Moses. If it is, then the modern Jow has above disobers Moses. If it is not, then polygamy is not binding on Jew or Gentile.

The polygamists also quote Deuteronomy xxv., 5-10—"if brethren dweil together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger; her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife and perform the duty of a husband's brother unto her. And it shall be that the first born which she bearett shall succeed in the name of his brother unto her. And it shall be that the first born which she bearett shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name shall not be put out of Israel. And it the man like not to take his brother's wife then let his brother's wife go up to the gate unto the elders and say, 'My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel, he will not perform the duty of my husband's brother.' Then the elders of his city shall call him and speak unto him, and if he stand to it, and say 'like not to take her,' then shall his brother's wife come unto him in the presence of the elders and loose his shoe from of his foot and spit in his face, and shall answer and say, '30 shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house.' And his name shall be called in Israel the house of him that hath his shoe loosed."

This is regarded as a strong proof-text by the polygamists. The object of this law is to secure the rights of primogeniture; in other words, to perpetuate ancestral names and ancestral inheritances. Now, we affirm that this law was not binding upon a married man, and there is no instance in the Bible where such a marriage was performed by a married man. For instance, take the case of Tamar. The sons of Judah were not married because of their youth; they were too young to have been married. So also take the case of Ruth. Ruth, you know, lost her husband, and she claimed Boaz, being a kinsman of her dead husband, to b

man, had a wife and children already, and he assigns this as the reason why he did not marry the beautiful Ruth.

The next passage to which I will call your attention is in Deut. xxi., 15-17:—"If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the oeloved and they have borne him children, both the oeloved and they have borne him children. The man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and if he first-born son be hers that was hated; then it shall be when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born. But he shall acknowledge the son of the hated for the first-born by giving him a double portion of all that he hath; for he is the beginning of his strength; the right of the first-born is his." Now what does this suppose—"If a man have two wives?" It is asserted that this implies that he has them simultaneously. I affirm that it does not imply this, but that he might have had them in succession, and the law applies as logically and as truly. For instance, a man is married, his wite dies, he marries again; the second wife he loves better than the first—and I believe that is the general rule here, more love for the last wife. (Laughter and applause.) He has children by both, and a shrewd woman having children, being a step-mother and a natural mother, would very naturally use her influence to induce her husband to confer special property favors upon her children in preference to that children of the former wife. Now Moses says yog shall not do that. If a man has married two wives and has children the both, he shall not out paide the rights of

AUGUST 18, 1870.—TRIPLE SHEET;

which the worker and independency may have been a compared to the compared to gree of proximity, and therefore both are forbidden by the law of God. Furthermore, if the marriage of a man and two sisters is here forbidden, which is in disputable, then verse is, according to Mormon interpretation, is a mere repetition of the law. More than this. If, for argument, we concede it means two literal sisters, yet that prohibition is not a permission for a man to take two wives who are not sisters; for all sound jurists will agree that a prohibition is one thing and a permission is another. Nay more, the Mormons do or do not receive the law of Moses as olinding. That they do not is clear from their own practice. For instance, in Lev. Xx., 14, 14 is said, "If a man take a wife and her mother it is wickedness; they shall be burnt with fire both he and they." Yet Mr. John Hyde, Jr., in his work called "Mormonism," page 56, states that a Mr. E. Bolton married a woman and her two daughters. And there are other cases in the Territory of the same kind. More than this: the Mormons say that Lev. xviii., 18, prohibits a man from marrying two sisters. Yet Mr. Hyde informs us that a Mr. Bavis married three sisters, that a Mr. Sharkey married the same number, and that Mr. Brigham Young advises that a man intending to marry two sisters should marry them on the same day, "for that will prevent quarrelling about who is first or second." (Page 56.)

Now, do the Mormons obey or disobey the law of Mosses' If they do not, as is clear from the above cited facts, what confidence can we have in their claim that because Moses sanctions their system of myler and the same and their claim that because Moses sanctions their system of myler and the same and the above cited facts, what confidence can we have in their claim that because Moses sanctions their system of the above cited facts, what confidence can we have in their claim that because Moses sanctions their system of this marrying two sisters, therefore the Divine silence in the ocase is the offset to the Divine silence in the ocase is the offset to the Divine silenc

the one case is the offset to the Divine silence in the other case.

Now we come to the fifth proposition—namely, that

THE SCRIPTURES POSITIVELY CONDEMN POLYGAMY.
Our first argument is drawn from the first marriage. "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one fiesh." What are the objections to this passago? First, it is asserted that if we are to infer monogamy from the creation of one man and one woman so are we to infer that all subsequent marriages are to be between brothers and sisters, because the immediate children of Adam and Eve were it not for one sublime fact—namely, that in the first marriage was God's law of marriage, and that law is referred to by Malachi and by Christ and by the Apostic Paul; but nowhere do you find an allusion obligatory that all subsequent marriages are to be confined to brothers and sisters. More than this, it is asserted that if the fact of the creation of one man and one woman proves monogamy, then the fact that the immediate sons of Adam married their sisters proves that marriage in all subsequent generations must not extend beyond brothers and sisters. Well, I accept the objection for argument's sake. But if it is affirmed that the extension of the marriage relation between the former it justifies the latter. (Applause.) Historians refer to the practice of polyandry, or a plurality of wives so it favors polygamy, or a plurality of wives so it favors polygamy. He was a plurality of husbands. I go in for equal rights, and it am an can have many wives a woman can have many husbands—(laughter)—and if the law of God justifies the former it justifies the latter. (Applause.) Historians refer to the practice of polyandry. It exists to day in some portions of the earth. I say if monogamy is right on the one hand then polyandry is right on the other. But the polygamists say that if monogamy is true, from the fact of the creation of one man and one woman, it also sanctions incest, because the immediate children of Adam

same is true of suicide. In both the end of man's creation is defeated, as is also the intention of the Divine Creator. In after years it became necessary to express the constitution of things in a positive law, and hence the command "Thou shalt not kill." But, on the contrary, the marriage of Adam's sons and deughters was not only in compliance with the Divine command to multiply, but was in accordance with the Intention of the Creator until otherwise ordered. It is an old saying, "Where there is no law there is no transgression," "Sin is the transgression of the law." Law may be expressed in the order of nature, or in a positive enactment. The marriage of Adam's sons and daughters was not ain in itself, and the crime of incost was not ain in itself, and the crime of incost was not ain in itself, and the crime of incost was not ain in itself, and the crime of incost was not ain in itself, and the crime of incost was not ain for the first time, the law of consangularity was given by Moses. But why should they bring up this objection of incost—of brother and sister marrying? Are there no such cases at the present time; no such cases in this our modern day? Is there not sophistry in the objection? Can we have faith in those who urge that objection? It is only urged for the want of sound and logical argument. Then this passage is repeated by Maischi ii., 14, 15:—"Yet ye say, wherefore? Because the Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously; yet is she thy companion and the wife of, thy covenant. And did no not make one?" That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth."

Now, what is the Mormon interpretation of this? It is here said, "And did he not make one?" That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth."

Now, what is the Mormon interpr

leave father and mother and shall cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together iet no man put asundor." First Moses, then Maiachi, then Jesus Christiakes up the same subject—the declaration of monogamy as a law. Then we pass on to the Apostle Paul, Eph. v., 23–31.—"So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself." "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh."

Now, let is sum up this argument. Here Moses stands amid the thunders of Mount Sina and announces to us the law of monogamy in the declaration of marriage in the innocency of man; then Maiachi, the last of the prophets, repeats it; then Jesus Christ comes, and "Ho who spake as never man spike" realitms what Moses and Malachi had said; then St. Paul, the greatest of the Apostles, who was caught up into the third heavens, reiterates what had been declared by Moses and Malachi and Josus Christ—namely, that marriage is union of one man and one woman, to the exclusion of the third party.

Our next argument its drawn from Deuteronomy xvil. 17, aliuding to the king—"Neither shall be multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away." The Mormons say that this is answered by the fact that it is also said in another piace. "He shall not multiply horses to himself," The answer to this is that there is no law limiting the number of horses, but there is a law limiting the number of wives. The original law, coming down through all the ages of the past, is one wife. Fina the qualty distinctly in Timothy iii, 2—"A bisnop, here in Urah And this doctrine is brought outequalty distinctly in Timothy iii, 2—"A bisnop, then, must be also the leavy of horses, had been declared on all hands that the Jewish high priest, that is their interpretation of the passace. But we allow a be a helder in the Church of God; if a minister loses his wife he must crase to be a minister until he give an another pas

more emphatic than "Let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband." It was because of these assertions that Blackstone, that great jurist, asserted that "polygamy is condemned by the law of the New Testament."

And in this connection it is proper to state a palpable contradiction in the assertions of the Mormon polygamists. They assert that monogamy came from the Greeks and Romans; they also assert that polygamy was universal at the time of Christ and his aposites. This last assertion is made to prove that polygamy sweet admitted to the early Christian Church. Now, if monogamy came from the Greeks and Romans, then polygamy could not have been universally prevalent; for it is admitted that at that time the Romans held sway throughout the civilized world, and where they held sway their laws prevailed.

But they say there were polygamists in that day. Very well. Let me tell you of a few. There was Herod, sometimes called the Great, who had ten wives, who murdered all the little children of Bethelmen from two years old and under; who put to death his second wife Mariamne; who ordered the execution of his eldest son Antipator, whom he had by his first wife Dorts, and who executed his two sons Alexander and Aristobulos, the children of Mariamne. Then there was Herod Antipas, who married his brother Phillip's wives white Phillip was still itving, and who, to please Salome the dancer, put John the Baptist to death. And then there was Josephus, who was suspected as a traitor both by Jews and Romans. Such, my friengs, were the polygamists of those days.

Now, we deduce an argument from the equalization of the sexes, or, in other words, the equal proportion of males and females. We assert that the great doctrine taught by Paul, "Let every man have her own hasband," Is founded upon an equally great physical was the first wife.

White population..... Colored population..... Indian population.....